

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/045,518	Applicant(s) VAN LUCHENE, ANDREW S.	
	Examiner James W Myhre	Art Unit 3622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W Myhre. (3) _____.

(2) Dean Alderucci. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 25-27 and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner noted that the above claims, while containing allowable subject matter, were not in the technological arts (e.g. non-statutory) and suggested an amended which would overcome a 101 rejection. The Applicant Representative approved adding the limitation "scanning a bar code on at least one item" as in the initial limitation in claims 25-27 and in the appropriate place in Claim 29 and requested an Examiner's Amendment be entered making these changes. The Examiner agreed to do so.